SOME REASONS FOR DISBELIEF IN EVOLUTION

BY

JUDGE J. P. HOBSON

FROM THE LIBRARY OF
William C. White, D. D.

RF
22
ZP
NO.3

IBR

THE LIBRARY
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
Richmond, Virginia 23227

To the end that the helpful ministry of this pamphlet may be extended to as many persons as possible, we cordially invite your aid in circulating it.

SOME REASONS FOR DISBELIEF IN EVOLUTION

BY

JUDGE J. P. HOBSON

OF

COURT OF APPEALS OF KENTUCKY

FRANKFORT, KY.

REVISED AND REPRINTED

FROM

PRESBYTERIAN OF THE SOUTH

DECEMBER 16, 1925

RICHMOND, VA.

SOME REASONS FOR DISBELIEF IN EVOLUTION

In view of the fact that of late so much has been published in regard to evolution, it may be of interest to state briefly some of the reasons for the old faith. By evolution is meant the theory that man by a process of nature has been evolved from the lower animals, his immediate ancestor being the monkey. The theory is that certain germs developed in water, that these germs in the process of time developed into animals, and as the eons went by man was evolved from them and gradually in countless eons reached his present development. This theory is not new. It is as old as history. Some of the reasons for not accepting it are these:

It Is Opposed to All the Facts of Human History.

If the theory is true, man has been on the earth for countless eons; but all history points to the origin of man in the highlands of Asia and his spreading out from there in a few centuries before the

dawn of history. The dawn of history begins in the valley of the Euphrates and the valley of the Nile. When each of these was a settled country with a written code of laws, Abraham and Lot divided between them Palestine, an unsettled country, 1,000 miles to the west of Ur of the Chaldees. Five hundred years after Ur of the Chaldees came Tyre at the northeast corner of the Mediterranean Sea and 600 miles west of Ur. Before David built and Solomon beautified Jerlsalem as his capital, 400 years after this, Priam was adorning and extending the power of Troy, the wave of humanity westward having parted at the northeast corner of the Mediterranean, part moving southward toward the Nile and part westward through Asia Minor. Memphis in Egypt then, too, was a great city. When Memphis, Jerusalem and Troy were great cities Sparta and Athens, across the sea and still further west, had not come into their own and the Greeks were still struggling with the wild beasts of the forest. Four hundred years later Romulus laid the walls of Rome 800 miles further west. About the same time the

Tyrians were building Carthage in Africa on the opposite side of the Mediterranean in the steady march of mankind westward. When Rome had grown great, 600 years later, Julius Caesar found in France and in England precisely the condition that prevailed in Greece, when Troy was a great city, and that prevailed in Italy when Remus jumped over the walls of Rome. Seventy years after Julius Caesar wrote his account of the condition of things in France and England, Varus lost his army in the trackless forests of Germany; Russia long after this was a waste of forests. The conditions then in Germany and Russia, now so thickly settled, were precisely what Columbus and those who followed him found in America 1,500 years later. Man was slower in getting to America from Asia because of the sea and the arctic wastes that lie between.

If man has been on the earth for countless eons, why was Troy a forest when Memphis was a great city? Why did the cities of Greece arise next and then Rome, and why was the land further west still for 600 years in virginal forests? Do

not the facts show a flow of humanity westward? If man has been on the earth for countless eons what was he doing, for since historic times he has cut away the forests and dispossessed the wild beasts. Do not the facts show that the dawn of history is not far removed in time from the dawn of humanity?

Consider how man has increased in numbers since historic times. The army that attacked Troy would not outnumber an American division. Alexander conquered the world with an army that would hardly hold a skirmish line today. The population of the world has quadrupled since Caesar's time. Of course we have no basis for figures except for the Roman Empire, but that included all the world they thought worth conquering. And if the rate of increase before was about the same as since, this will put the infancy of the race only a few centuries before historic times. Consider also what progress man may make in a few centuries. In the last two hundred years he has subdued the forests, built great cities and highways and established civilization in

North and South America, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, etc.

It Is Opposed to the Growth of Human Language.

If man is simply the descendant of the protoplasm, his speech, too, is an evolution, beginning with the simplest forms, consisting first of only the names of things and gradually becoming more complex as the eons rolled by. But the facts are just the other way. English and French are largely from Latin, but Latin is much more complex than either. Latin has six cases for nouns, etc., with different endings for each. There are five declensions, all different. The Latin verb has moods and tenses, each ending with its own forms. There is little of this in French and none in English except a few irregular verbs which have survived from the older more complex English tongue. But Latin is less complex than its older sister Greek. The Greek verb has moods, tenses and participles unknown in Latin. By its verbal endings it expresses in one word an idea accurately which we can only express by a phrase, if at all. Old

Latin and old Greek, like old English and old German, are more complex than the later tongue. Half the beauty of Homer, the oldest Greek book, is lost, when not read in the original, because English has no equivalent for Homer's words, and even the Greek of Homer is less complex than its two older sisters, Hebrew and Chaldee. Back of them is the old parent stock of all, Aryan, more complex than they.

Such are the facts, and they point unerringly to the truth of the tradition universal among these ancient peoples that language was the gift of God and in its original form was far more complex and more beautiful than the languages spoken later or today. The fact is, there has been everywhere a discarding of inflections and a substitution of simpler forms as far back as we have any means of knowledge. How could this be true if language originated as maintained by Evolutionists? At the dawn of history we find man in possession of a complex language with many inflections far exceeding in beauty and expressiveness the languages of today. It is a great mis-

take to assume that those from whom we are descended were at the dawn of history illiterate savages. Their language shows the contrary.

It Is Contrary to the Facts of Nature.

Nature's laws are immutable. Like produces like. The leopard cannot change his spots, nor the tiger his skin. One of the immutable laws of nature is that species will not cross. Were it otherwise long ago the world would be filled with hybrids. Hogs have always been hogs. Horses have always been horses, and so with every other species. The human species will not cross with any other. It is therefore a distinct species. The testimony of the rocks confirms this. Like has always produced like. There is no more evidence in the rocks that man is descended from the monkey than there is that he descended from the hog or the horse or the bear.

If the laws of nature change not and like has always produced like, where did man come from? Not from some two species by inbreeding, for there is no inbreeding between different species. Not from an existing species by a gradual im-

provement by which some left others behind and so evolved in time a new species, for members of a species will always breed with others of the same species. Man is as distinctly a species, separate from other species as lions, horses or hogs. A species may be divided into branches, some of which develop up along one line and another down on another line; and however unlike they may be, they will breed back, but when the species is different, they will not breed. Some of mankind have developed upward, others have degenerated from sloth, ignorance or vice, but the species has remained. Human blood and bones are unlike those of animals.

Evolution is a theory, not a fact. A theory is a man's conclusion from the facts; and it may be warranted or unwarranted by them. It is said that the theory of evolution is accepted today by all scientists, but the fact is far otherwise. Louis Agassiz did not believe in it and there are thousands of others like him. See what a few of them say:

"The attempts to find the transition from animal to man have ended in total

failure. The middle link has not been found, and never will be."—Professor Virchow.

"Nine-tenths of the talk of evolutionists is sheer nonsense, not founded on observation, and wholly unsupported by fact."—Dr. Etheridge.

"In support of all naturalistic conjectures concerning man's origin, there is not at this time a shadow of scientific evidence."—Professor Lionel S. Beale.

"It is not the result of scientific research, but purely the product of imagination."—Professor Fleischman.

"It is doubtful if at any time in the world's history there has been a theory that has gained such popularity with such an unsubstantial basis as that of the evolution of man from the lower orders."—Professor John S. Newbury.

The fact is, we have filled our colleges with graduates of the atheistic schools of Germany and we must not mistake the noisy clamor of a few seeking notoriety for the solid judgment of mankind. The facts being before him, any man of common sense can form his judgment upon them. Very learned men are often not

men of good judgment. The judgment of a man in daily contact with life, if he knows the facts, is usually more to be trusted. The facts have all been published, the conclusion to be drawn from them is not peculiarly a question for the scientists.

The so-called proof of evolution consists of unwarranted inferences from a few partial skeletons found here and there to which great antiquity is ascribed. But time writes no date upon them; 100 years may pass for 10,000. When articles are found these may be correctly timed from historical knowledge and so are shown to be of historic time. There have always been men of defective craniums, and such men have often lived in caves. The finding of such remains here and there prove nothing, though lying under the bones of prehistoric animals, for mankind has always buried its dead. All caves were made by the action of water and things found at one point may have come from another.

An apt illustration of the proofs of evolution is the Pithecanthropus (ape man), a picture of which adorns all their books

giving the descent of man. In 1891 Dr. Dubois, in excavating in the Island of Java, found a tooth at a depth of forty-five feet, a month later and a few feet away, he found the roof of a skull. Ten months later, and forty-eight feet away he found a thigh bone. There was nothing connecting the tooth, the piece of skull or thigh bone, or explaining why, if parts of one skeleton, they were not together. The find was submitted to twenty-four scientists at Leyden in 1894. Ten of them said they were the bones of an ape. The others differed. Seven thought them the bones of a man. Professor Cunningham said it was absolutely certain the bones did not belong to the same animal; and yet on this foundation has been constructed, out of imagination, the picture presented to the world as a fact. The other proofs are of precisely like substance.

It Is Contrary to the Bible.

Evolution teaches that man is decended from the lower animals and so is a mere animal. The Bible teaches that God is love, that all men are His immortal children, that He wills that they love Him

and one another and will judge them for the deeds done in the body. The issue is inevitable. Is man an immortal being or a mere animal? Many people seem to think that only the first three chapters of Genesis are in issue. Not so; the whole Bible is false if man is not immortal. All agnostics are evolutionists. Few evolutionists are Christians, and these simply fail to carry the theory to its necessary logical result. The common sense of mankind will never stop there. If the protoplasm was not immortal, and like produces like, how did any of its descendants become immortal? If all of man's forbears were of the earth and nothing more, how is he different from them? The conclusion is inevitable; either evolution is false or the Bible view of man is false.

The Bible is a beautiful epic whose central figure is Jesus, the Christ. Though it consists of sixty-six books, written by different men in different ages, it all centers in Him. All the Old Testament points to the Saviour to come; all the New to the crucified and living Lord. The

pith of His teaching is man's immortality. This is the reason for His coming. He came that God's will might be done on earth as it is in heaven. But there was no reason for the Son of God coming if man is a mere animal, and with men, as with the animal world, might and not right is to prevail. Bernhardi and Nietschie only carried evolution to its logical result when they boldly taught that "they should take who have the power" and so brought about the World War.

The Bible cannot be false. It purports to be the Word of God. If it is not His Word, it is a fraud, and where did it come from? Who conceived the character of the Nazarene? Who conceived His teaching? In all human history nothing approaching the conception disclosed in the Bible as a whole was ever conceived. No other life ever approached His. No man ever spake as this man. Does anybody believe that those Galilean fishermen originated this? Think what His teaching has done for the world. It is the world's character builder. Compare the condition of the Christian nations of

the world with those not Christian. Our fathers came to America with the Bible in their hands. All our institutions are based upon it. By their fruits ye shall know them. Did any fraud in all time produce such results as the Bible produces in individuals or in nations?

Its Tendency Is Downward and Not Upward.

The logical result of evolution is that man being a mere animal may gratify his animal appetites where and when he can, and that there is no moral responsibility. We live in a time of unrest, moral restraints are losing their hold, crimes against society abound and womanhood has not been spared. These things are the natural result of a teaching that denies moral responsibility. If it is continued and becomes the accepted view, will this make our land a better place to live in, or produce a better citizenship than our fathers reared under the old faith?

The Bible sanctifies marriage. The animals do not. If man is a mere animal, why should he sanctify it any more than

they? Why not, as the bull, fight off all others and keep a herd for himself? The Bible ennobles woman. It has raised her to the station she occupies in every Christian land. She does not occupy this station in lands where the animal theory is acted upon. Is there any man who loves his country or children who would like to see marriage less sacred than it is or to see womanhood reduced to the level she occupies in heathen lands?

Christianity has reared every orphanage or asylum for the unfortunate that the world ever saw. Such things were unknown until the Christ taught men that they should do unto their neighbor as they would have him do unto them. It is carrying everywhere the message that men should love one another. Does not this tend to make a better world? Has belief in evolution ever spurred a man to love his neighbor as himself? Is not its logical sequence the survival of the fittest; including, of course, his majesty myself?

Evolution has been taught to the children in the public schools of Germany for over two generations as part of the

war propaganda of the militarists. The child has not the ability to judge the facts. The result is infidel Germany and the World War. Shall we follow in its footsteps? Shall we, like the nations of old, when they grew rich, forget God? Will America then be a better place to live in? The responsibility rests largely upon the daily press. The fight is on. There is no middle ground.

No one denies evolutionists the right to open their own schools and teach evolution to the children of those who at their own expense wish their children so taught. Every man has the right to exercise his own judgment in the matter; but when the State establishes and maintains a school, it may say what shall be taught in it. A State depends on the character of its people. Nothing that tends to lower character should be taught in a State school. The Bible builds character. Jesus is the light of the world.

Let no man deceive himself. The issue is here. Shall America remain a Christian country? Shall it go up or down? Our daily press, with few notable exceptions, is openly atheistic. Our young peo-

ple return from our State Universities agnostic and with their faith shaken in the Bible as the Word of God. When the foundation is shaken, is it strange that morality declines and crimes abound? Evolution denies the divinity of our Lord, for it denies everything miraculous. Christianity is faith in the Christ, the living Lord. Without the Bible we are adrift on life's sea without chart or compass.

God is truth. The truth elevates, it does not lead man downward or away from God. God's work never tends to brutalize mankind. Evolution is the latest fad to this end. Its parentage is shown in the logical effects of its teaching. It necessarily denies that "there is a providence that shapes our ends, rough sew them how we will." When belief in immortality, in responsibility to God, and in the authority of God's Word is rejected, evolution is carried to its logical results. Does any one believe that this would bring peace on earth and good will to men? Compare the lives of those who do believe with the lives of those who were reared and have lived in lands where God's Word is unknown.